

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. TSAI/0005**REMARKS**

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated April 22, 2004, in which Claims 1-17 were rejected. Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the above amendments, are believed to render the claims at issue patentable.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 11, 15, and 16 are amended, and Claims 7 and 14 are canceled. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added and that the originally filed specification, drawings, and claims support the amendments.

Claim Objection

With respect to the Paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Claims 1, 2, 6, 11, and 16 are objected.

In response to the above objections, Claims 1, 2, 6, 11, and 16 have been amended to overcome the objections. Regarding Claim 1, "to transform the optical signals into electronic signals and in a reverse transformation" is replaced by "for processing optical/electronic signals", and it means that converting electronic signals into optical signals and converting optical signals into electronic signals. Regarding Claims 2, 11, and 16, the extra word, "the" or "a", has been erased. Regarding Claim 6, the claim has been amended to depend upon Claim 5. Regarding Claims 2 and 11, "uses" is replaced by "makes use of".

Page 7

288180_1

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. TSAI0005

Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added and that the originally filed specification, drawings, and claims support the amendments. Applicant respectfully request that the above objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

With respect to the Paragraph 3 of the Office Action, Claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particular point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In response to the rejection, Claim 10 has been amended to overcome the rejection. There is a typographical error in the previous version. The correct optical signal transmitter is to transform output electronic signals into output optical signals and transmit the output optical signals to the optical fiber connecting interface.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that amended independent Claim 10 is allowable over the art of record and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections of Claims 10-17. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

With respect to the Paragraphs 4-5 of the Office Action, Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being unpatentable over Poplawski et al. (U.S. Patent 5,717,533) in view of Schachter (U.S. Patent 4,044,888).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. With particular reference to Poplawski et al. (U.S. Patent 5,717,533), the prior art discloses a robust optoelectronic transceiver module. The robust optoelectronic transceiver module utilizes a male ribbon

Page 8

288180_1

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. TSAI/0005

style connector 66 extending from the potting material 62 to be coupled to a female ribbon style connector 126 mounted onto the circuit card assembly 128. Particularly, the robust optoelectronic transceiver module is inserted into the female ribbon style connector 126 in the direction perpendicular to the circuit card assembly 128.

The present application utilizes a golden finger connecting interface to be inserted into a corresponding socket mounted on a printed circuit board. Especially, the golden finger connecting interface is inserted into the corresponding socket in the direction parallel to the printed circuit board.

Accordingly, the structures of the prior art and the present application are different. Furthermore, the golden finger connecting interface can effectively reduce the total size of the pluggable optical transceiver module of the present application, and the pluggable optical transceiver module can be removed from or inserted into the corresponding socket in the direction parallel to the printed circuit board. In addition, the pluggable optical transceiver module of the present application can be applied to a single channel bi-direction small form factor optical transceiver module.

Both of Poplawski and Schachter never teach or suggest using the golden finger connecting interface to reduce the size of the pluggable optical transceiver module and to insert into the corresponding socket parallel to the printed circuit, especially for the pluggable single channel bi-direction small form factor optical transceiver module.

When applying 35 U.S.C. §103, the following tenets of patent law must be adhered to:

- (A) The claimed invention must be considered as a whole;
- (B) The references must be considered as a whole and must suggest the

Page 9

289180_1

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. TSAI/0005

desirability and thus the obviousness of making the combination;

(C) The references must be viewed without the benefit of impermissible hindsight vision afforded by the claimed invention and

(D) Reasonable expectation of success is the standard with which obviousness is determined.

Hodosh v. Block Drug Co., Inc., 786 F.2d 1136, 1143 n.5, 229 USPQ 182, 187 n.5 (Fed. Cir. 1986). (MPEP §2141)

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). (MPEP §2143.03 All Claim Limitations Must Be Taught or Suggested)

Since the prior art does not teach or suggest the golden finger connecting interface to reduce the size of the pluggable optical transceiver module, and the structures of the prior art and the present application are also different, the pluggable optical transceiver modules of Claims 1 and 10 are patentable over these references.

The pluggable optical transceiver module of the present application with the golden finger connecting interface can effectively reduce the size thereof, especially the size of the pluggable single channel bi-direction small form factor optical transceiver module of the present application. Accordingly, Applicant submits that amended independent Claims 1 and 10 are allowable over the art of record and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) rejection of Claims 1 and 10. In addition, insofar as Claims 2-9, and 11-17 depend from independent Claims 1 and 10 respectively and add further limitations thereto, Applicant requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) rejections of these claims be withdrawn as well. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. TSAI/0005

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims as currently presented are in condition for allowance and hereby respectfully requests reconsideration. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience.

Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the art cited but not relied upon by the Examiner. Applicant has concluded that these references do not affect the patentability of the claims as currently presented.

Respectfully submitted,



William B. Patterson
Registration No. 34,102
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Page 11

268180_1